

1 Mark C. Carlson, Esq., [SBN 166195]
2 Warren K. Miller, Esq., Of Counsel [SBN 141638]
3 **CARLSON LAW GROUP, INC.**
4 21031 Ventura Boulevard, Suite 1100
5 Woodland Hills, California 91364
6 Telephone No.: (818) 996-7800
7 Facsimile No.: (818) 884-4285
8 E-Mail: wkm@carlsonlawgroup.com

9 Attorneys for Defendants, SILVERWOOD PROPERTIES, INC. and KENNETH HOWARD
10 SHAPIRO

FILED
Superior Court of California
County of Los Angeles

NOV 16 2017

Sherrill B. Carter, Executive Officer/Clerk
By  Deputy
Marlon Gomez

8 **SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

9 **COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES**

11 DAVID A. GLAZER, an individual,

12 Plaintiff,

13 vs.

14 CHENEY ADRIENNE SHAPIRO; CHENEY
15 SHAPIRO DESIGNS 401K; CHENEY SHAPIRO
16 DESIGNS; CHENEY ADRIENNE SHAPIRO,
17 TRUSTEE OF DEFENDANT CHENEY SHAPIRO
18 DESIGNS 401K; RESOURCEFUL
19 DEVELOPMENTS, INC.; RICHARD JUDSON
20 WILLIAMS; SILVERWOOD PROPERTIES, INC.;
21 KENNETH HOWARD SHAPIRO; PODLEY
22 ASSOCIATES REALTORS; LINDA
23 DARLINGTON SEYFFERT; SEISMIC SAFETY,
24 INC.; EDUMUND J. SYLVIS; KEN LAMARR
25 COMPTON; AND DOES 2 THROUGH 250.

26 Defendants.

Case No.: BC669741
Complaint Filed: July 25, 2017
Assigned to Honorable Richard E. Rico
Dept.: 17

**ANSWER OF DEFENDANTS
SILVERWOOD PROPERTIES, INC.
AND KENNETH HOWARD SHAPIRO
TO THE FIRST AMENDED
COMPLAINT OF PLAINTIFF DAVID A.
GLAZER**

26 Defendants SILVERWOOD PROPERTIES, INC. and KENNETH HOWARD SHAPIRO
27 (collectively the "Answering Defendants"), for themselves only, file their Answer to the First
28 Amended Complaint ("FAC") filed by Plaintiff DAVID A. GLAZER (hereinafter "Plaintiff") as
follows:

27 ///

GENERAL DENIAL

By virtue of and pursuant to the provisions of the Code of Civil Procedure section 431.30, these Answering Defendants, generally and specifically deny each and every, all and singular, conjunctively and disjunctively, the allegations contained in said FAC, and each and every part thereof, and each and every cause of action thereof, and further specifically deny that Plaintiff has been injured or damaged in the sum alleged, or in any other sum, or at all, by reason of any carelessness, negligence, act or omission of these Answering Defendants.

FIRST AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

(Fails to State Facts Sufficient to Constitute a Cause of Action)

1. As a first and separate affirmative defense to each and every cause of action stated in Plaintiff's FAC as against them, these Answering Defendants allege that said causes of action fail to state facts sufficient to constitute a cause or causes of action against these Answering Defendants.

SECOND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

(Statute of Limitations)

2. As a second and separate affirmative defense to each cause of action asserted against them, these Answering Defendants allege that Plaintiff's FAC on file herein is barred by reason of the applicable statutes of limitations, including but not limited to Code of Civil Procedure sections 337, 340, 337.1, 337.15, 338, 339, 343 and Civil Code section 2079.

THIRD AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

(Comparative Negligence)

3. As a third and separate affirmative defense to each and every cause of action stated in the FAC as against them, these Answering Defendants allege that Plaintiff was negligent in and about the matters alleged in the FAC and failed to exercise due care for his own protection and that Plaintiff's damages, if any, are directly and proximately result in whole or in part from Plaintiff's own negligence. Accordingly, Plaintiff's damages must be reduced in proportion to Plaintiff's own fault in bringing about his damages.

11

111

FOURTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

(Third Party Negligence)

4. As a fourth and separate affirmative defense to each cause of action asserted against them, these Answering Defendants allege that third parties were careless and negligent in and about the matters alleged in the FAC, and that said carelessness and negligence on the part of said third parties proximately contributed to the happening of the accident and to Plaintiff's injuries, loss and/or damage, if any, allegedly sustained. Therefore, any damages awarded to Plaintiff shall be diminished in proportion to the amount of fault attributed to said third parties.

FIFTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

(Laches)

5. As a fifth and separate affirmative defense to each cause of action asserted against them, these Answering Defendants allege that the FAC on file herein is barred by reason of Plaintiff's laches in that Plaintiff waited an unreasonable period of time to bring his FAC, to the detriment of these Answering Defendants.

SIXTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

(Unclean Hands)

6. As a sixth and separate affirmative defense to each cause of action asserted against them, these Answering Defendants allege that Plaintiff is barred by reason of Plaintiff's coming into court with unclean hands.

SEVENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

(Waived Right to Relief Sought)

7. As a seventh and separate affirmative defense to each cause of action asserted against them, these Answering Defendants allege that Plaintiff has waived his rights to the relief sought in the FAC against these Answering Defendants by virtue of its acts, conduct, representations and omissions.

111

111

EIGHTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

(Mitigate Damages)

8. As a eighth and separate affirmative defense to each and every cause of action asserted against them, these Answering Defendants allege that Plaintiff could have, by the exercise of reasonable diligence, limited or prevented his damages, if any, as a result of the actions alleged in the FAC and that Plaintiff has failed or refused to do so. Such failures or refusals on the part of Plaintiff constitute failure to mitigate his damages.

NINTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

(Acts of Fictitiously Named Defendants)

9. As a ninth and separate affirmative defense to each cause of action asserted against them, these Answering Defendants are informed and believe and thereon allege that they are not legally responsible for the acts and/or omissions of those defendants fictitiously named herein as DOES.

TENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

(Intervening, Supervening and Superseding Causes)

10. As an tenth and separate affirmative defense to each cause of action asserted against them, these Answering Defendants are informed and believe and thereon allege that the injuries and damages of which the Plaintiff complains were proximately caused or contributed to by the acts of other defendants, persons and/or entities. Said acts were in intervening, supervening and superseding a cause of the injuries and damages, if any, of which the Plaintiff complains, thus barring Plaintiff from any recovery against these Answering Defendants.

ELEVENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

(Estoppel)

11. As a eleventh and separate affirmative defense to each cause of action asserted against them, these Answering Defendants are informed and believe, and thereon allege, that Plaintiff has engaged in conduct with respect to the activities and/or premium which are the subject of the FAC, and by reason of said activities and conduct, is estopped from asserting any claim for damages or seeking any other relief against these Answering Defendants.

TWELFTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

(Damages Caused by Acts or Omissions Beyond Answering Defendants' Control)

12. As a twelfth and separate affirmative defense to each cause of action asserted against them, these Answering Defendants are informed and believe, and thereon allege, that the damages sustained by Plaintiff, if any, were proximately caused by the acts, omissions, negligence, fraud, and/or breach of obligations by persons other than these Answering Defendants and beyond these Answering Defendants' supervision and control.

THIRTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

(Standard of Care Met)

13. As a thirteenth and separate affirmative defense to each cause of action asserted against them, these Answering Defendants are informed and believe, and thereon allege, that in all aspects these Answering Defendants met the applicable standard of care regarding Plaintiff.

FOURTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

(Active Negligence of Plaintiff)

14. As a fourteenth and separate affirmative defense to each cause of action asserted against them, these Answering Defendants are informed and believe, and thereon allege that the damages sustained or to be sustained by Plaintiff, if any, were proximately caused or contributed to by the active negligence of Plaintiff in that he personally participated in a negligent act or omission that brought about the injuries or damages of which he is now complaining. Consequently, neither the law nor any agreement entitles Plaintiff to an indemnity.

FIFTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

(Non-Economic Damages)

15. As a fifteenth and separate affirmative defense to each cause of action asserted against them, these Answering Defendants' liability for non-economic damages, if any, is limited to that percentage of those damages which are in direct proportion of these Answering Defendants' percentage of fault in accordance with Civil Code section 431.2(a).

111

11

SIXTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

(Lack of Privity)

16. As a sixteenth and separate affirmative defense to each cause of action asserted against them, these Answering Defendants were not parties to the original agreement which forms the basis of Plaintiff's FAC and, therefore, Plaintiff lacks the required privity to raise the claims alleged.

SEVENTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

(Lack of Justifiable Reliance)

17. As a seventeenth and separate affirmative defense to each cause of action asserted against them, these Answering Defendants are informed and believe, and thereon allege, that Plaintiff lacked any justifiable reliance concerning the supposed misstatements attributed to these Answering Defendants.

EIGHTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

(Set-Off to Recovery)

18. As a eighteenth and separate affirmative defense to each cause of action asserted against them, these Answering Defendants are informed and believe, and thereon allege, that they are entitled to a set-off as a result of any recovery made by Plaintiff from any other party, in connection with the damages claimed in this lawsuit.

NINETEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

(Damages Did Not Arise From Defendant's Alleged Breach)

19. As a nineteenth separate affirmative defense to each cause of action asserted against them, these Answering Defendants are informed and believe, and thereon allege, that as to each alleged cause of action set forth in the FAC, the conditions set forth therein and the damages related thereto did not arise out of any action by these Answering Defendants nor any act or omission related thereto and thus recovery is precluded.

11

111

111

TWENTIETH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

(Reasonable Reliance on Information Provided by Owner)

20. As a twentieth and separate affirmative defense to each cause of action asserted against them, these Answering Defendants are informed and believe, and thereon allege, that they and their representative agents justifiably relied on information furnished by the owner or by persons directly employed by the owner of the subject property set forth in the FAC.

TWENTY-FIRST AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

(Reservation of Right to Assert Additional Affirmative Defenses)

21. As a twenty-first and separate affirmative defense to each cause of action asserted against them, these Answering Defendants allege that they currently have insufficient information upon which to form a belief as to whether he may have additional, as yet unstated, affirmative defenses available. These Answering Defendants therefore reserve the right to assert additional affirmative defenses in the event discovery indicates that they would be appropriate.

WHEREFORE, these Answering Defendants prays as follows:

1. That Plaintiff take nothing by way of his FAC on file herein;
 2. That judgment be entered in the within action in favor of these Answering Defendants upon the issues of the FAC;
 3. For an award to these Answering Defendants of attorney's fees, if allowed by law, and costs of suit herein incurred; and
 4. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

Dated: November 15, 2017

CARLSON LAW GROUP, INC.

By:

Mark C. Carlson, Esq.
Warren K. Miller, Esq., Of Counsel
Attorneys for Defendants, SILVERWOOD
PROPERTIES, INC. and KENNETH HOWARD
SHAPIRO

PROOF OF SERVICE

STATE OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

I am employed in the County of Los Angeles, State of California. I am over the age of 18 and not a party to the within action; my present address is: 21031 Ventura Boulevard, Suite 1100, Woodland Hills, California 91364.

On November 15, 2017, I served the foregoing document described as **ANSWER OF DEFENDANTS SILVERWOOD PROPERTIES, INC. AND KENNETH HOWARD SHAPIRO TO THE FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT OF PLAINTIFF DAVID A. GLAZER** on the parties by placing a true copy thereof enclosed in a sealed envelope addressed as follows:

SEE ATTACHED SERVICE LIST

XX BY MAIL as follows: I am "readily familiar" with the firm's practice of collection and processing correspondence for mailing. Under that practice it would be deposited with the U.S. Postal Service on that same day with postage thereon fully prepaid at Woodland Hills, California in the ordinary course of business.

BY OVERNIGHT EXPRESS DELIVERY. I deposited it in a box or other facility regularly maintained by GOLDEN STATE OVERNIGHT/FEDERAL EXPRESS, or delivered it to a driver or courier authorized by GOLDEN STATE OVERNIGHT/FEDERAL EXPRESS to receive documents, in an envelope designated by GOLDEN STATE OVERNIGHT/FEDERAL EXPRESS, with deliver fees provided for, and with delivery requested for the next business day.

BY FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION, by use of facsimile machine telephone number (818) 884-4285, in accordance with Code of Civil Procedure §1013(e) and California Rules of Court 2.306, to the within parties at the facsimile number(s) indicated. The fax machine I used complied with Rule 2.301 and this transmission was reported as complete and without error. Under Rule 2.304, I caused the machine to print a transmission record of the transmission report which was issued by the transmitting facsimile machine, a copy of which is attached to the original thereof.

Executed on November 15, 2017, at Woodland Hills, California.

XX (State) I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the above is true and correct.


Karon Rudolph

David A. Glazer v. Cheney Adrienne Shapiro, et al.
LASC Case No.: BC669741

Ronald A. Hartmann, Esq.
Kurt E. Kananen, Esq.
HARTMANN & KANANEN
5743 Corsa Avenue, Suite 119
Westlake Village, CA 91362
Telephone No.: (818) 710-0151
Facsimile No.: (818) 710-0191
E-Mail: Ronald Hartmann <constructiondefects@sbcglobal.net>
E-Mail: Kurt E. Kananen <kurtkananen@sbcglobal.net>
Attorneys for Plaintiff DAVID A. GLAZER

Timothy R. Lee, Esq.
LAW OFFICES OF TIMOTHY R. LEE
445 S. Beverly Drive, 2nd Floor
Beverly Hills, CA 90212
Telephone: (310) 826-2666
Facsimile: (310) 826-2696
E-Mail: Timothy R. Lee <trleelaw@hotmail.com>
Attorneys for Plaintiff DAVID A. GLAZER

Victor M. Campos
Manning & Kass, Ellrod, Ramirez, Trester, LLP
801 S. Figueroa St., 15th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90017
Telephone: (213) 624-6900/Facsimile: (213) 624-6999
E-Mail: Victor M. Campos <vmc@manningllp.com>
Attorneys for Defendants, KEN L. COMPTON; EDMUND J. SYLVIS; SEISMIC SAFETY, INC.

Alisa E. Sandoval, Esq.
Richardson, Harman & Ober, PC
234 E. Colorado Blvd., Suite 800
Pasadena, CA 91101
Telephone: (626) 449-5577/Facsimile: (626) 449-5572
E-Mail: Alisa E. Sandoval <alisa@richardsonober.com>
Attorneys for Defendants, CHENEY A. SHAPIRO, CHENEY SHAPIRO DESIGNS; CHENEY SHAPIRO, TRUSTEE OF CHENEY SHAPIRO DESIGNS 401K; CHENEY SHAPIRO DESIGNS 401K; RICHARD J. WILLIAMS; RESOURCEFUL DEVELOPMENTS, INC.

Andrew L. Leff, Esq.
Spile, Leff & Goor, LLP
16501 Ventura Blvd., Suite 610
Encino, CA 91436
Telephone: (818) 784-6899/Facsimile: (818) 784-0176
E-Mail: Andrew L. Leff <aleff@spilelaw.com>

Attorneys for Defendants, LINDA D. SEYFFERT; PODLEY ASSOCIATES, REALTORS